



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/961,294	09/25/2001	Jin-young Lee	1568.1024	6532
21171	7590	06/17/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			WEINER, LAURA S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1745	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/961,294	LEE, JIN-YOUNG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Laura S Weiner	1745	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7, 9-17 and 19-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-24 and 26-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 9-17, 19, 25 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5-26-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Wen et al. teaches in the abstract that the waterborne polyurethane (WPU) can be crosslinked. Applicant argues that Wen et al. does not teach the specified crosslinking agents but these elements are part of the product by process limitation in which the examiner has found the product. The crosslinking agent does not become part of the polymeric electrolyte comprising a crosslinked polyether. With respect to the product by process claims 1-7, the determination of patentability is based upon the product itself not upon the method of its production. *In re Thrope* 227 USPQ 964; *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685; *In re Bridgeford* 149 USPQ 55; *In re Wertheim* 191 USPQ 90. Any difference imparted by the product by process limitations would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the Examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to establish that their product is patentably distinct. *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann* 180 USPQ 324.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. Claims 1-7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Wen et al. (6,077,897).

Wen et al. teaches in column 1, lines 5-8 and column 2, lines 21-54, a composite

electrolyte consisting of a waterborne polyurethane (WPU), a polyethylene oxide (PEO) and liquid electrolytes. Wen et al. teaches providing a polyurethane material (polymerizing a dried hydroxyl group containing component and an isocyanato group (-NCO) containing component to form a prepolymer of polyurethane as a matrix material; dispersing the matrix material in a first solvent and mixing PEO in the same solvent to form a dispersion solution; drying the dispersion to form a thin composite film of WPU-PEO as a matrix of the polymeric electrolyte and then adding a component of an anhydrous liquid electrolyte into the matrix to form the WPU-PEO based composite electrolyte. Wen et al. teaches in column 5, Examples 3-5 that 1 M of LiCF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>/PC, LiClO<sub>4</sub>/PC or LiPF<sub>6</sub>/PC/DEC was used based on the composite electrolyte. Wen et al. teaches in column 6, claim 5, that the isocyanogroup can be toluene diisocyanate, isophorone diisocyanate, etc. and teaches in claim 8 that the hydroxyl group can be polyethylene glycol, polypropylene glycol, etc. Wen et al. teaches in column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 5, polymerizing the polydiol compound and the diisocyanate compound at a temperature between 60-100 degrees C. Wen et al. teaches in the abstract that the waterborne polyurethane (WPU) can be crosslinked which are used in lithium ion batteries, lithium batteries, etc.

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product by process claims 1-7, as opposed to the product taught by Wen et al., such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results. *In re Thrope* 227 USPQ 964; (Fed. Cir. 1985).

With respect to the product by process claims 1-7, the determination of patentability is based upon the product itself not upon the method of its production. *In re Thrope* 227 USPQ 964; *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685; *In re Bridgeford* 149 USPQ 55; *In re Wertheim* 191 USPQ 90. Any difference imparted by the product by process limitations would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the Examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to establish that their product is patentably distinct. *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann* 180 USPQ 324.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 9-10, 11-17, 19, 25 are allowed over the prior art of record because no prior art was found teaching the specified crosslinked polyether urethane polymeric electrolyte contained in a lithium battery having in addition a separator having a network structure and made of an insulating resin.

#### ***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1745

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura S Weiner whose telephone number is 571-272-1294. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1745

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Laura S. Weiner  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1745

June 15, 2004